arXiv:1504.08056v3 [math.GT] 11 Nov 2016

# PRIMITIVE STABLE REPRESENTATIONS IN HIGHER RANK SEMISIMPLE LIE GROUPS

INKANG KIM AND SUNGWOON KIM

Abstract. We define primitive stable representations of free groups into higher rank semisimple Lie groups and study their properties. Let $\Sigma$ be a compact surface with one boundary component. Then we show that the holonomies of convex projective structures on $\Sigma$ are primitive stable. Furthermore we prove that all positive representations of $\Sigma$ in $\mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ are primitive stable. In $\mathrm{PGL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ case, we prove the uniform regularities of positive representations.

## 1. Introduction

Recently, much attention has been paid to the generalization of convex cocompact groups in rank one symmetric spaces to higher rank symmetric spaces. The successful story along this line is Anosov representations introduced by Labourie [14] and developed further by Guichard and Wienhard [9]. In recent papers of Kapovich-Leeb-Porti, more geometric criteria for Anosov representations are given. Among those properties, the concept of Morse actions of word hyperbolic groups is outstanding [12]. On the other hand, Minsky [20] proposed the notion of primitive stable representations in real hyperbolic 3-space. We combine these notions to give the set of primitive stable representations of free groups into higher rank semisimple Lie groups. See [10, 15] for criteria of primitive stability for handlebodies and its generalization to compression bodies in the case of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$.

Let $G$ be a higher rank semisimple Lie group without compact factors, $X$ the associated symmetric space, and $\Gamma$ a free group of $n$-generators. Then a notion of primitive stable representations into higher rank semisimple Lie groups can be defined by using either Kapovich-Leeb-Porti's [12, Definition 7.14] or Guéritaud-Guichard-Kassel-Wienhard's [8, Theorem 1.3]. Any of two results would give an equivalent definition. In this paper we will use the concept of Morse quasigeodesics in [12]. We define a representation $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ to be *primitive stable* if any bi-infinite geodesic in the Cayley graph of $\Gamma$ defined by a primitive element is mapped under the orbit map to a uniformly Morse quasigeodesic in $X$. Let $\mathcal{PS}(\Gamma, G)$ be the set of conjugacy classes of primitive stable representations. We study their stability and properness of the action of the outer automorphism group $Out(\Gamma)$ of $\Gamma$. Indeed, the

---

[1] 2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification: 32G15, 22F30, 20E05*

[2] *Key words and phrases. Primitive stable, Morse action, Positive representation.*

[3] I. Kim gratefully acknowledges the partial support of grant (NRF-2014R1A2A2A01005574) and a warm support of UC Berkeley during his stay. S. Kim gratefully acknowledges the partial support of Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (NRF-2015R1D1A1A09058742).

openness of $\mathcal{PS}(\Gamma, G)$ directly follows from the stability of the Morse property in [12, Section 7]. Furthermore it easily follows from the argument of Minsky [20] that the action of $Out(\Gamma)$ on $\mathcal{PS}(\Gamma, G)$ is properly discontinuous. Hence one easily has the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $\Gamma$ be a free group and $G$ a semisimple Lie group without compact factors. Then the set $\mathcal{PS}(\Gamma, G)$ of primitive stable representations is open in the character variety $\mathcal{X}(\Gamma, G)$ of $\Gamma$ in $G$, and the action of the outer automorphism $Out(\Gamma)$ of $\Gamma$ on $\mathcal{PS}(\Gamma, G)$ is properly discontinuous.*

From the definition of primitive stable representation, it is clear that any Anosov representation is primitive stable. The main point of the paper is to give the concrete examples of primitive stable representations which are not Anosov representations. Here are our main theorems.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let $\Sigma$ be an orientable, connected, compact surface with one boundary component. Then the holonomy representations of convex projective structures on $\Sigma$ are primitive stable.*

There are three kinds of the holonomies of convex projective structures; Anosov representations, Positive representations and Quasi-hyperbolic representations. The holonomies of convex projective structures with hyperbolic geodesic boundary are Anosov and positive representations, and the holonomies of convex projective structures of finite Hilbert volume with cusps are positive but not Anosov representations. Every quasi-hyperbolic representation, a representation whose boundary curve is quasi-hyperbolic, admits an equivariant continuous map $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$. But the map is not antipodal due to the geometric property of quasi-hyperbolic isometry. See Section 5 for details. Hence quasi-hyperbolic representations are neither Anosov representations nor Positive representations. However it turns out that they are primitive stable. Theorem 1.2 gives examples of primitive stable representations which are neither Anosov nor positive.

Looking at the case of $\mathrm{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, we explore further that positive representations in $\mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ are primitive stable. First of all, we prove that

**Proposition 1.3.** *Every positive representation in $\mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular.*

For the definition of $\sigma_{mod}$-regular representation, see Section 2.3. Proposition 1.3 has been unknown for positive representations which are not Anosov representations. If a representation is not Anosov, it is not easy to check its regularity. Given a boundary embedded representation, we find out how to see their regularities. Here a boundary embedded representation means a representation $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ for a (relatively) hyperbolic group $\Gamma$ which admits a $\rho$-equivariant homeomorphism $\xi : \partial_\infty \Gamma \to G/P$ for some parabolic subgroup $P$ of $G$. For more details, see Section 7. In particular we prove a stronger result in the $\mathrm{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$-case.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Every positive representation in $\mathrm{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ is uniformly $\sigma_{mod}$-regular.*

Note that the holonomies of convex projective structures with quasi-hyperbolic elements are not uniformly $\sigma_{mod}$-regular (see Lemma 8.2). Both Proposition 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 might be important in studying the notion of relatively Anosov representations in future since positive representations with unipotent elements are regarded as important examples in developing a notion of relatively Anosov representation.

To prove that a representation is $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable, the $\sigma_{mod}$-regularity for all primitive bi-infinite gedesics is necessary (see Definition 2.1). Proposition 1.3 implies that every positive representation satisfies this property. In the case of a compact surface with one boundary component, we prove the following theorem by combining Proposition 1.3 with the blocking property of the one boundary component in [20].

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let $\Sigma$ be an orientable, connected, compact surface with one boundary component. Then every positive representation from $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ into* $\mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ *is $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable.*

From Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.5, we have the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 1.6.** *Let $\Gamma$ be a non-abelian free group. Then there is an open subset of $\mathcal{X}(\Gamma, \mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R}))$, strictly larger than the set of Anosov representations, which is $Out(\Gamma)$-invariant, and on which $Out(\Gamma)$ acts properly discontinuously.*

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section, we describe basic notions and results that are necessary to define and study primitive stable representations in higher rank semisimple Lie groups.

### 2.1. Free group, primitive element and Whitehead Lemma.

Given a generating set $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$ of a non-abelian free group $\Gamma$, the Cayley graph $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma, S)$ is a 1-dimensional tree whose vertices are words in $S$, and two words $v$ and $w$ are connected by a length one edge if and only if $v = ws_i$ for some $s_i \in S$. A group $\Gamma$ acts on its Cayley graph on the left, i.e. for $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

$$(\gamma, w) \to \gamma w.$$

This action is an isometry since for any $s$ in $S$

$$d(w, v) = d(sw, sv).$$

An element of $\Gamma$ is called *primitive* if it is a member of a free generating set. Each conjugacy class $[w]$ in $\Gamma$ determines $\overline{w}$, the periodic word determined by concatenating infinitely many copies of a cyclically reduced representative of $w$. A cyclically reduced word $w$ defines a unique invariant line $\widetilde{w}$ through the origin $e$ in the Cayley graph. Each $\overline{w}$ lifts to a $\Gamma$-invariant set of bi-infinite geodesics in $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma, S)$. Indeed, this invariant set is the orbit of $\widetilde{w}$ under the action of $\Gamma$.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ denote the set consisting of $\overline{w}$ for conjugacy classes $[w]$ of primitive elements of $\Gamma$ and $\mathcal{P}$ the set of all bi-infinite geodesics $q : \mathbb{Z} \to \Gamma$ in $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma, S)$ lifted from $\overline{w}$ for all primitive elements $w$ in $\Gamma$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of all bi-infinite geodesics in the Cayley graph of $\Gamma$. Then $\mathcal{P}$ is the smallest closed $Out(\Gamma)$-invariant subset of $\mathcal{B}$. It is known that $\mathcal{P}$ is a strict subset of $\mathcal{B}$.

For a word $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the Whitehead graph $Wh(\gamma, S)$ is the graph with $2n$ vertices labeled $s_1, s_1^{-1}, \ldots, s_n, s_n^{-1}$, and edge from $v$ to $w^{-1}$ for each string

$vw$ that appears in $\gamma$ or in a cyclic permutation of $\gamma$. Whitehead proved that for a cyclically reduced word $\gamma$, if $Wh(\gamma, S)$ is connected and has no cutpoint, then $\gamma$ is not primitive. We refer the reader to [21, 22] for more information. One says that a reduced word $\gamma$ is *primitive-blocking* if it does not appear as a subword of any cyclically reduced primitive word and *blocking* if some power $\gamma^m$ is primitive-blocking. An immediate corollary of the Whitehead lemma is that for a once-punctured surface, the cusp curve $c$ is blocking. Indeed $c^2$ cannot appear as a subword of any primitive element, since $Wh(c^2, S)$ is a cycle [20].

2.2. **Cartan decomposition.** Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be the set of real diagonal $n \times n$ matrices with trace 0 and $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$ be the set of elements of $\mathfrak{a}$ whose entries are in nonincreasing order. Let $G = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ and $K = \mathrm{SO}(n)$. Then the Cartan decomposition $K(\exp \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+)K$ means that each $g \in G$ can be written $g = k(\exp \mu(g))k'$ for some $k, k' \in K$ and a unique $\mu(g) \in \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$. A Cartan projection

$$\mu : G \to \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$$

is defined as the map sending $g \in G$ to $\mu(g)$.

2.3. **Morse quasigeodesic.** Let $G$ be a semisimple Lie group without compact factors and $K$ be a maximal compact subgroup of $G$. Let $X$ be the associated symmetric space of noncompact type. Let $\partial_\infty X$ denote the visual boundary of $X$. Let $W$ be the Weyl group acting on a model maximal flat $F_{mod} \cong \mathbb{R}^r$ of $X$ and on the model apartment $a_{mod} = \partial_\infty F_{mod} \cong S^{r-1}$ where $r$ is the real rank of $G$. The pair $(a_{mod}, W)$ is the spherical Coxeter complex associated with $X$. Then the spherical model Weyl chamber is defined as the quotient $\sigma_{mod} = a_{mod}/W$. The natural projection $\theta : \partial_\infty X \to \sigma_{mod}$ restricts to an isometry on every chamber $\sigma \subset \partial_\infty X$. For a chamber $\sigma \in \partial_\infty X$ and a point $x \in X$, the *Weyl sector* $V(x, \sigma)$ is defined as the union of rays emanating from $x$ and asymptotic to $\sigma$. The Euclidean model Weyl chamber $\Delta$ is defined as the cone over $\sigma_{mod}$ with tip at the origin.

For two points $x, y \in X$, the $\Delta$-valued distance $d_\Delta(x, y)$ is defined as follows: Choose a maximal flat $F$ containing $x$ and $y$. Identifying $F$ isometrically with $F_{mod}$, regard $x$ and $y$ as points in $F_{mod}$. Then $d_\Delta(x, y)$ is defined by

$$d_\Delta(x, y) = proj(y - x) \in \Delta$$

where $proj : F_{mod} \to F_{mod}/W \cong \Delta$ is the quotient map. The resulting $\Delta$-valued distance $d_\Delta(x, y)$ does not depend on the choices of $F$. Indeed if we normalize $K$ to be the stabilizer of $x$, and $V(x, \sigma_{mod})$ to be $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$, then for any $g \in G$ with a Cartan decomposition $K(\exp \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+)K$, $d_\Delta(x, gx)$ can be identified with the Cartan projection $\mu(g)$. For more details on $d_\Delta$, see [11].

Let $\partial_{Tits} X$ be the Tits boundary of $X$. For a simplex $\tau \subset \partial_{Tits} X$, $\mathrm{st}(\tau)$ is the smallest subcomplex of $\partial_{Tits} X$ containing all chambers $\sigma$ such that $\tau \subset \sigma$. The open star $\mathrm{ost}(\tau)$ is the union of all open simplices whose closure intersects $\mathrm{int}(\tau)$ nontrivially. For a face $\tau_{mod}$ of the model Weyl chamber $\sigma_{mod}$, $\mathrm{ost}(\tau_{mod})$ denotes its open star in $\sigma_{mod}$. A point $\xi \in \partial_{Tits} X$ is called *$\tau_{mod}$-regular* if $\theta(\xi) \in \mathrm{ost}(\tau_{mod})$ where $\theta$ is the type map defined as the canonical projection map

$$\theta : \partial_\infty X \to \partial_\infty X/G = \sigma_{mod}.$$

If $\theta(\xi) \in \Theta$ for a compact set $\Theta \subset \mathrm{ost}(\tau_{mod})$, then $\xi \in \partial_\infty X$ is said to be *$\Theta$-regular*. A geodesic segment $xy$ is called *$\Theta$-regular* (resp. *$\tau_{mod}$-regular*) if it is contained in a geodesic ray $x\xi$ with $\xi$ $\Theta$-regular (resp. $\tau_{mod}$-regular). A $\Theta$-star of a simplex $\tau$ of type $\tau_{mod}$ is $\mathrm{st}_\Theta(\tau) = \mathrm{st}(\tau) \cap \theta^{-1}(\Theta)$. Then the $\Theta$-cone $V(x, \mathrm{st}_\Theta(\tau))$, which is a union of geodesic rays from $x$ and asymptotic to $\mathrm{st}_\Theta(\tau)$, is convex in $X$. For more information, see [12, Section 2].

**Definition 2.1** ($\tau_{mod}$-regularity, [12])**.** A sequence $g_n \to \infty$ in $G$ is *$\tau_{mod}$-regular* if for some (hence any) $x \in X$,

$$d(d_\Delta(x, g_n x), V(0, \sigma_{mod} - \mathrm{ost}(\tau_{mod}))) \to +\infty \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

We also say that a sequence $(x_n)$ is *$\tau_{mod}$-regular* if for some (hence any) $x \in X$, the above condition is satisfied.

A *$\Theta$-diamond* of a $\Theta$-regular segment $xy$ is

$$\diamondsuit_\Theta(x, y) = V(x, \mathrm{st}_\Theta(\tau_+)) \cap V(y, \mathrm{st}_\Theta(\tau_-))$$

where $\tau_+$ is a unique simplex $\tau$ of type $\tau_{mod}$ such that the geodesic ray $x\xi$ containing $xy$ lands on $\mathrm{st}(\tau)$ and $\tau_-$ is similarly defined.

**Definition 2.2** (Morse quasigeodesic, [12])**.** A continuous map $p : I \to X$ is called an *$(L, A, \Theta, D)$-Morse quasigeodesic* if it is an $(L, A)$-quasigeodesic and for all $t_1, t_2 \in I$, the subpath $p|_{[t_1,t_2]}$ is $D$-close to a $\Theta$-diamond $\diamondsuit_\Theta(x_1, x_2)$ with $d(x_i, p(t_i)) \leq D$ where $\Theta$ is $\iota$-invariant $\tau_{mod}$-convex compact set and $\iota(\tau_{mod}) = \tau_{mod}$. Here $\iota$ is $-w_0$ and $w_0$ is the longest element of the Weyl group.

2.4. **Frenet curves.** A curve $\xi : S^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is said to be *hyperconvex* if for any distinct points $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ the sum

$$\xi(x_1) + \cdots + \xi(x_n)$$

is direct. A hyperconvex curve $\xi : S^1 \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is said to be a *Frenet curve*, if there exists a curve $(\xi^1, \xi^2, \dots, \xi^{n-1})$ defined on $S^1$, called the *osculating flag curve*, with values in the full flag variety such that for every $x \in S^1$, $\xi(x) = \xi^1(x)$, and moreover

- For every pairwise distinct points $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ in $S^1$ and positive integers $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ such that
  $$\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \leq n,$$
  then the sum
  $$\xi^{n_1}(x_1) + \cdots + \xi^{n_k}(x_k)$$
  is direct.
- For every $x$ in $S^1$ and positive integers $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ such that
  $$m = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \leq n,$$
  then

$$\lim_{\substack{(y_1,\dots,y_k)\to x,\\ y_i \text{ all distinct}}} \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} \xi^{n_i}(y_i) \right) = \xi^m(x). \tag{1}$$

Labourie [14] showed that every Hitchin representation admits an equivariant hyperconvex Frenet curve and Fock-Goncharov showed that a positive representation admits an equivariant osculating Frenet curve ([4] Theorem 9.4).

2.5. **Positive representations.** The notion of positive representations has been introduced by Fock and Goncharov [4]. Let $G$ be a real split semisimple Lie group with trivial center, $B$ a Borel subgroup, $U = [B, B]$ maximal unipotent group, and $\mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod}) = G/B$ full flag variety. Lusztig [18] introduced the notion of totally positive elements. A real matrix is *totally positive* if all its minors are positive. Let $B^{\pm}$ be opposite Borel subgroups and $U^{\pm}$ corresponding unipotent groups. Denote the set of totally positive elements of $U^+$ by $U^+(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$. A configuration of flags $(B_1, \dots, B_k)$ is *positive* if it can be written as

$$(B^+, B^-, (u_1)B^-, (u_1u_2)B^-, \dots )$$

where $u_i \in U^+(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$. A configuration of $k$ real flags $(F_1, \dots, F_k)$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is *positive* if there exists a smooth convex curve $\xi$ such that the flag $F_i$ is an osculating flag at a point $x_i \in \xi$ and the order of the points $x_1, \dots, x_k$ is compatible with an orientation of $\xi$.

Let $\Sigma$ be a compact oriented surface with (possibly) boundary and negative Euler number. A finite volume hyperbolic metric on $\Sigma$ is *admissible* if the completion of $\Sigma$ is a surface with totally geodesic boundary components and cusps. The boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p$ of $\Sigma$ with $p$ cusps is the boundary at infinity of the universal cover $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ of $\Sigma$ equipped with some admissible metric on $\Sigma$. Then the set $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p$ has a cyclic ordering on points depending on the orientation of $\Sigma$. For the representation $\rho$ of an admissible hyperbolic metric on $\Sigma$, the set $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p$ is identified with the limit set of $\rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$. For more detail, see [17, Section 2].

A continuous map

$$\xi : \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$$

is *positive* if for any positively oriented $k$-tuple in $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p$, $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$, their images $(\xi(x_1), \dots, \xi(x_k))$ is a positive configuration of flags. A representation $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to G$ is called *positive* if there exists a positive $\rho$-equivariant continuous map $\xi : \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$ for some $p$. We list the properties of positive representations $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to G$ in [4].

(1) $\rho$ is discrete and faithful.
(2) $\rho(\gamma)$ is positive hyperbolic for any non-peripheral loop $\gamma$, i.e., conjugate to an element of $G(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$.

Property (2) implies that $\rho(\gamma)$ has attracting and repelling fixed points in $\mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$.

## 3. PRIMITIVE STABLE REPRESENTATIONS

In this section, we give a definition of primitive stable representations and explore a necessary and sufficient condition for a representation to be $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable. Given a representation $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ and a basepoint $x \in X$, a $\rho$-equivariant orbit map $\tau_{\rho,x} : \mathcal{C}(\Gamma, S) \to X$ is defined by $\tau_{\rho,x}(w) = w \cdot x$.

Now we are ready to define a notion of primitive stable representations into higher rank semisimple Lie groups.

**Definition 3.1.** A representation $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is $\tau_{mod}$*-primitive stable* if there exist constants $L, A, D$ and a compact set $\Theta \subset \mathrm{ost}(\tau_{mod})$ for some face $\tau_{mod}$ of the model Weyl chamber $\sigma_{mod}$ and a basepoint $x \in X$ such that the orbit map $\tau_{\rho,x}$ takes all leaves of $\mathcal{P}$ to $(L, A, \Theta, D)$-Morse quasigeodesic.

From now on we focus on $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable representations in $\mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$. We will say that $\mathcal{P}$ is $\sigma_{mod}$*-regular* for $\rho$ if $\tau_{\rho,x}(\tilde{w})$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular for any primitive $w$. Then we can get a necessary and sufficient condition for a representation to be $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable as follows.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let* $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ *be a discrete representation of a free group* $\Gamma$*. Then* $\rho$ *is* $\sigma_{mod}$*-primitive stable if and only if the following hold:*

(i) *For every primitive word* $w$*, its image* $\rho(w)$ *is diagonalizable over* $\mathbb{R}$ *with eigenvalues that have pairwise distinct norms.*
(ii) *There is a uniform constant* $E$ *such that* $\tau_{\rho,x}(\tilde{\omega})$ *remains at a bounded distance* $E$ *from a unique maximal flat connecting the attracting and repelling Weyl chambers at infinity of* $\rho(\tilde{\omega})$ *for every* $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}$*.*
(iii) $\mathcal{P}$ *is* $\sigma_{mod}$*-regular for* $\rho$*.*

*Proof.* First suppose that $\rho$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable. Then (i) and (iii) immediately follow from the definition of primitive stable representations as follows. For (i), let $\lim_{n \to \pm\infty} \rho(w^n)x_0 \to \xi^{\pm}$ and $\sigma^{\pm}$ be two opposite Weyl chambers containing $\xi^{\pm}$. Then $\rho(w)$ fixes $\sigma^{\pm}$, hence leaves invariant the maximal flat $F$ connecting $\sigma^{\pm}$. By conjugating, we may assume that $\rho(w)$ stabilizes a standard flat spanned by diagonal matrices and $\sigma^{\pm} = \pm\mathfrak{a}^{+}(\infty)$. Then using the Cartan decomposition $\rho(w) = s\exp(\mu)t$, to fix $\sigma^{\pm}$, it is easy to see that $t = s = id$ and $\mu \in \overline{\mathfrak{a}^{+}}$. By $\sigma_{mod}$-regularity, it is easy to see that the entries of $\mu$ are all distinct. The property (iii) follows from the definition.

Furthermore, since $\tau_{\rho,x}$ maps all bi-infinite geodesics of $\mathcal{P}$ to $(L, A, \Theta, D)$-Morse quasigeodesics, for any $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}$ its orbit $l = \tau_{\rho,x}(\tilde{\omega})$ remains within a distance $E = E(L, A, D)$ from the unique maximal flat $F$ connecting the attracting and repelling Weyl chambers at infinity of $\rho(\omega)$. This can be seen as follows. Choose $t_i, s_j$ so that $|t_i - s_i| \to \infty$ and that $l(t_i)$ and $l(s_i)$ converge to points in attracting and repelling Weyl chambers of $\rho(w)$. By the definition of $(L, A, \Theta, D)$-Morse quasigeodesic, the segment $[l(t_i), l(s_i)]$ is $D$-close to a $\Theta$-diamond $\Diamond_{\Theta}(x_i, y_i)$. Then it is obvious that as $i \to \infty$, $\Diamond_{\Theta}(x_i, y_i)$ converges to $F$. Then using the quasigeodesic constant $L, A$, it is easy to see that $l = \tau_{\rho,x}(\tilde{\omega})$ remains within a distance $E = E(L, A, D)$ from the unique maximal flat $F$ for some constant $E$ depending only on $L, A$ and $D$. Hence (ii) also follows.

Conversely, assume that (i), (ii) and (iii) hold for a representation $\rho$. The proof follows rather easily by the work of Kapovich, Leeb and Porti in [12]. We here give a proof based on [12]. First the discreteness of $\rho$ makes it possible that the distance between orbit points of $\mathcal{P}$ can be bounded below in terms of the word length on the Cayley graph of $\Gamma$. Hence for any $C_1 > 0$, there exists a constant $R_1 = R_1(\rho, x) > 0$ such that for all $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ that are elements on bi-infinite geodesics in $\mathcal{P}$,

$$\text{if } |\gamma^{-1}\eta| \geq R_1, \text{ then } d_X(\rho(\gamma)x, \rho(\eta)x) \geq C_1.$$

Let $q : \mathbb{Z} \to \Gamma$ be a bi-infinite geodesic in $\mathcal{P}$. For notational easiness, we denote $\rho(q(m))x$ by $q(m)x$. Any action of $\Gamma$ should be understood via $\rho$. Then $d_X(q(m)x, q(m+n)x) \geq C_1$ for $n \geq R_1$ and any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Also note that by triangle inequality

$$d_X(q(m)x, q(m+n)x) \leq \sum_{k=m}^{m+n-1} d_X(q(k)x, q(k+1)x) \leq Ln, \tag{2}$$

where $L = \max_{s \in S} d_X(x, sx)$ over a fixed generating set $S$ of $\Gamma$. This shows that for any given $n_0$, for any $m$, the segment from $q(m)x$ to $q(m+n_0)x$ can be regarded as a $(L, A)$-quasigeodesic if we choose $A$ large enough.

Consider the nearest point projection $\bar{q}(n)$ of $q(n)x$ to $\mathcal{F}(\sigma_+, \sigma_-)$ where $\sigma_+$ and $\sigma_-$ are the unique attracting and repelling flags for $\rho(q)$, and $\mathcal{F}(\sigma_+, \sigma_-)$ is the unique maximal flat connecting two opposite flags $\sigma_+$ and $\sigma_-$. Note that (i) guarantees for the existence of such attracting and repelling flags for $\rho(q)$. By (ii), the orbit $qx$ of a bi-infinite geodesic $q$ remains at a bounded distance $D$ from $\mathcal{F}(\sigma_+, \sigma_-)$. Using the triangle inequality

$$|d_\Delta(x, y) - d_\Delta(x', y')| \leq d_X(x, x') + d_X(y, y'),$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &|d_\Delta(q(m)x, q(n)x) - d_\Delta(\bar{q}(m), \bar{q}(n))| \\ &\qquad \leq d_X(q(m)x, \bar{q}(m)) + d_X(q(n)x, \bar{q}(n)) \leq 2D \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore $\mathcal{P}$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular by (iii) and thus, for any given $C_2 > 0$ there exists a uniform constant $R_2 = R_2(\rho, C_2)$ such that

$$d(d_\Delta(x, \eta x), \partial\Delta) \geq C_2$$

for any word $\eta$ with $|\eta| \geq R_2$ that is on some bi-infinite geodesic in $\mathcal{P}$. Note that

$$d_\Delta(q(m)x, q(m \pm n)x) = d_\Delta(x, q^{-1}(m)q(m \pm n)x).$$

Hence these two inequalities above make it possible to choose a uniform constant $n_0 = n_0(\rho, x)$ such that

$$\bar{q}(m \pm n) \in V(\bar{q}(m), \sigma_\pm)$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq n_0$. This implies that if $m_3 - m_2, m_2 - m_1 \geq n_0$, then

$$d_\Delta(\bar{q}(m_1), \bar{q}(m_2)) + d_\Delta(\bar{q}(m_2), \bar{q}(m_3)) = d_\Delta(\bar{q}(m_1), \bar{q}(m_3)).$$

Since there are only finitely many elements with word-length $n_0$, there exists a compact Weyl convex subset $\Theta \subset int(\sigma_{mod})$ depending on $\rho$ and $x$ such that the segment $\bar{q}(n)\bar{q}(n+n_0)$ are $\Theta$-regular for all $q \in \mathcal{P}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The additivity of $\Delta$-distance implies that $\bar{q}$ and hence $qx$ are $(L, A, \Theta, D, S)$-local Morse quasigeodesic by taking $A$ and $S$ large enough once $n_0$ is fixed. Then $q$ is an $(L', A', \Theta', D')$-Morse quasigeodesic for some uniform constants $L'$, $A'$ and $D'$ independent of $q$ (see Section 4.1). This completes the proof. □

## 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Theorem 1.1 follows from the works of Kapovich-Leeb-Porti and Minsky. For reader's convenience, we recall their works and then sketch a proof briefly.

4.1. **Openness.** The openness of primitive stable representations follows from the property that a local Morse quasigeodesic is a global quasigeodesic. An $(L, A, \Theta, D, S)$-local Morse quasigeodesic in $X$ is a map $p : I \to X$ such that for all $t \in I$, the subpath $p|_{[t,t+S]}$ is an $(L, A, \Theta, D)$-Morse quasigeodesic. It is shown in [12, Theorem 7.18] that for $L, A, \Theta, \Theta', D$ with $\Theta \subset \text{int}(\Theta')$, there exist $S, L', A', D'$ such that every $(L, A, \Theta, D, S)$-local Morse quasigeodesic in $X$ is an $(L', A', \Theta', D')$-Morse quasigeodesic.

Let $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ be a primitive stable representation. Fix a word metric on the Cayley graph of a group $\Gamma$ and consider the orbit map for a fixed base point $x \in X$. Then there exist constants $(L, A, \Theta, D)$ such that any bi-infinite geodesic defined by a primitive element is mapped to an $(L, A, \Theta, D)$-Morse quasigeodesic satisfying strict inequalities. Then for any $S > 0$, every primitive bi-infinite geodesic is mapped by the orbit map to a $(L, A, \Theta, D, S)$-local Morse quasigeodesic. It is not difficult to see that this still holds for all representations sufficiently close to $\rho$. Furthermore noting that local Morse quasigeodesics are global Morse quasigeodesic, it follows that all representations sufficiently close to $\rho$ map primitive bi-infinite geodesics to $(L', A', \Theta', D')$-Morse quasigeodesics under the orbit map, i.e., they are primitive stable. We refer the reader to [12, Section 7] for more detailed proof about this.

4.2. **Properness of the action of** $Out(\Gamma)$**.** This follows from the similar argument of Minsky [20]. Just for completeness we give an outline. By the definition of primitive stability of $\rho$, there exists $r = r(\rho) > 0$ such that for $w \in \Gamma$,

$$r\|w\| < t_\rho(w),$$

where $t_\rho(w)$ is a translation length of $\rho(w)$, and

$$\|w\| = \inf_{g\in\Gamma} |gwg^{-1}|$$

is the infimum of the word lengths among its conjugates with respect to a fixed generators. By triangle inequality,

$$t_\rho(w) < R\|w\|$$

for $R$ depending on $\rho$. Hence once a compact set $C$ in the set of primitive stable representations is given, there exist uniform $r$ and $R$ on $C$. Hence if $[\Phi] \in Out(\Gamma)$ satisfies $[\Phi](C) \cap C \neq \emptyset$, then for $[\rho]$ in this intersection

$$\|\Phi(w)\| \leq \frac{1}{r} t_\rho(\Phi(w)) \leq \frac{R}{r}\|w\|.$$

But it is shown that such $[\Phi]$ is a finite set [20].

## 5. CONVEX PROJECTIVE STRUCTURES

A convex projective structure on a surface $\Sigma$ is a representation of $\Sigma$ as a quotient $\Omega/\Gamma$ where $\Omega$ is a convex domain in $\mathbb{RP}^2$ and $\Gamma$ is a discrete subgroup of $\text{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ acting properly and freely on $\Omega$. Note that the set of convex projective structures on a surface is strictly bigger than the set of positive representations of the surface.

Let $\Sigma$ be a compact surface with $b$ boundary components. According to Goldman, the space $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ of convex real projective structures on $\Sigma$ with geodesic boundary is of dimension $-8\chi(\Sigma)$. Here the boundary is assumed to be represented by closed geodesics each having a geodesically convex collar neighborhood. When each boundary component of $\Sigma$ is required to be parabolic, the projective structures become strictly convex projective structures of finite Hilbert volume. The dimension of such a space is $-8\chi(\Sigma) - 2b$.

The holonomy representations of convex projective structures with geodesic boundary are all Anosov representations and hence primitive stable. The natural question arises whether general convex projective structures on $\Sigma$ are primitive stable.

According to the classification of isometries of $\mathrm{PGL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ acting on a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{RP}^2$, if $\Omega$ is not a triangle, we have the following cases. See [19] for details.

(1) **Hyperbolic :** the matrix is conjuagate to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda^+ & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda^- \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{where } \lambda^+ > \lambda^0 > \lambda^- > 0 \\ \text{and } \lambda^+\lambda^0\lambda^- = 1. \end{array}$$

(2) **Quasi-hyperbolic :** the matrix is conjugate to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{where } \alpha, \beta > 0, \alpha^2\beta = 1 \\ \text{and } \alpha, \beta \neq 1. \end{array}$$

(3) **Parabolic :** the matrix is conjugate to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

(4) **Elliptic :** the matrix is conjugate to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ 0 & \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } 0 < \theta < 2\pi.$$

The axis of a (quasi)-hyperbolic isometry, which is a segment connecting the eigenvectors $p^-, p^+$ corresponding to $\lambda^-, \lambda^+$ ($\beta, \alpha$ for quasi-hyperbolic case) eigenvalues, can lie on $\partial\Omega$. In such a case, $\Omega$ is not strictly convex. The point corresponding to $\lambda^0$ is outside $\Omega$ for hyperbolic isometry and the line corresponding to the eigenvalue $\alpha$ is outside $\Omega$ for quasi-hyperbolic case. This line is one of two tangent lines of $\Omega$ at $p^+$. The tangent line of $\Omega$ at $p^-$ contains the axis of the quasi-hyperbolic isometry. See [19]. By this reason, the limit curve from $\partial_\infty\pi_1(\Sigma)$ to the flag variety does not satisfy the positivity at two points $p^\pm$. Hence the corresponding holonomy representation is not positive.

We first look into the regularities of convex projective structures.

5.1. **Regularities of convex projective structures.** If a discrete subgroup of a seimsimple Lie group without compact factors is not a Morse subgroup, it is not easy to check its regularity. However fortunately there is a tool to check the regularity of $\Gamma$ in the case of $\mathrm{PGL}(3,\mathbb{R})$. Throughout this section, denote $\mathrm{PGL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ by $G$ for simplicity. Embed $G$ into $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and then define $\bar{G}$ to be the closure of $G$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Then $\bar{G}$ is a compactification of $G$. Note that the rank of any matrix on the boundary $\partial G$ of $G$ is either 1 or 2. We say that a sequence $(g_k)$ of $G$ is a *rank* 1 *sequence* if $(g_k)$ converges to a matrix of rank 1 in $\bar{G}$. Similarly a sequence in $G$ is said to be a *rank* 2 *sequence* if it converges to a matrix of rank 2 in $\bar{G}$.

**Lemma 5.1.** *A discrete subgroup* $\Gamma$ *of* $\mathrm{PGL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ *is* $\sigma_{mod}$*-regular if and only if there are no rank* 2 *sequences in* $\Gamma$.

*Proof.* Assume that $\Gamma$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. As explained in Section 2.3, if we normalize $K$ to be the stabilizer group of $x$ and write the Cartan decomposition as $G = K\bar{A}^{+}K$, then $d_{\Delta}(x,\gamma x)$ can be identified with the Cartan projection $\mu(\gamma) \in \overline{\mathfrak{a}^{+}}$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Given a sequence $(\gamma_k) \to \infty$ in $\Gamma$, the sequence $\mu(\gamma_k)$ of the Cartan projections of $\gamma_k$'s is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. This means that if we write $\mu(\gamma_k) = (a_k, b_k, c_k)$ with $a_k \geq b_k \geq c_k$, then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}(a_k - b_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty}(b_k - c_k) = \infty$$

since the difference of the coordinates are distances from the walls of the Weyl chamber. The Cartan decomposition of $\gamma_k$ is written as $\gamma_k = s_k e^{\mu(\gamma_k)} t_k$ for some $s_k, t_k \in K$. Then since $s_k, t_k \in K$, one can pass to a subsequence so that $s_k \to s_\infty$, $t_k \to t_\infty \in K$. From this, it immediately follows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} e^{-a_k} s_\infty^{-1} \gamma_k t_\infty^{-1}$$

converges to a rank 1 matrix and hence $(\gamma_k)$ is a rank 1 sequence.

Conversely assume that $\Gamma$ is not $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. Then there exists a sequence $(\gamma_k)$ in $\Gamma$ such that $(a_k - b_k)$ is uniformly bounded. By the same reasoning as above, we can see that $e^{-a_k}\gamma_k$ converges to a matrix of rank 2. Hence the converse direction is proved. □

We learned Lemma 5.1 from M. Kapovich during his visit to KIAS. Before we prove the regularities of convex projective structures, we recall the following fact due to Benzécri [2] a half century ago.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let* $\Omega$ *be a properly convex domain in* $\mathbb{RP}^n$. *Suppose that a sequence* $(g_k)$ *in* $Aut(\Omega)$ *converges to a projective transformation* $g_\infty$ *in* $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}))$. *Then* $g_\infty(\Omega)$ *is a face* $F$ *on* $\partial\Omega$ *and the range of* $g_\infty$ *is the subspace generated by* $F$. *For any compact set* $Z$ *in the complement of the kernel of* $g_\infty$, $g_k(Z)$ *uniformly converges to* $g_\infty(Z)$. *Furthermore the kernel of* $g_\infty$ *has empty intersection with* $\Omega$.

Now we give a proof for the $\sigma_{mod}$-regularities of convex projective structures.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let* $\Sigma$ *be a compact, oriented surface with (possible) boundary and negative Euler number. Let* $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{PGL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ *be the holonomy of a convex projective structure on the interior of* $\Sigma$. *Then* $\rho$ *is* $\sigma_{mod}$*-regular.*

*Proof.* For any such a holonomy representation $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, let $\Omega$ be an invariant domain. Let $(\gamma_n)$ be an infinite sequence in $\rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$ which converges to $\gamma_\infty$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Then due to Theorem 5.2, $\gamma_\infty(\Omega)$ is a face on $\partial\Omega$. If there are no 1-dimensional faces on $\partial\Omega$, $\gamma_\infty(\Omega)$ must be a point on $\partial\Omega$. Then we are done. Hence we suppose that $\partial\Omega$ has 1-dimensional faces and $\gamma_\infty(\Omega)$ is a 1-dimensional face $F$ on $\partial\Omega$. Note that $F$ must be equal to some conjugate image of the axis of $\rho(b)$ for some boundary component $b$ of $\Sigma$ and moreover $\rho(b)$ is either hyperbolic or quasi-hyperbolic. Let $\gamma$ be the (quasi)-hyperbolic isometry translating along $F$.

Choose a connected compact subset $C$ of $\Omega$ with nonempty interior. Since $C$ is a Zariski-dense subset of $\mathbb{RP}^2$, it suffices to show that $\gamma_n(C)$ converges to a point on $\partial\Omega$ due to Lemma 5.1 or Corollary 6.3. According to Benzécri's theorem, $C$ is contained in the complement of the kernel of $\gamma_\infty$ and thus $\gamma_n(C)$ uniformly converges to $\gamma_\infty(C)$. Clearly,

$$\gamma_\infty(C) \subset \gamma_\infty(\Omega) = F.$$

Then we claim that $\gamma_\infty(C)$ cannot contain any interior point of $F$. If $\gamma_\infty(C)$ contains an interior point of $F$, there exists a point $p$ of $C$ such that $\gamma_\infty(p)$ is an interior point of $F$. On the other hand $\gamma_n(p)$ converges to the interior point of $F$, $\gamma_\infty(p)$. However this is impossible since any orbit of $p$ under the action of $\rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$ can never converge to any interior point of $F$ by considering the action of $\gamma$ on $F$. For if $D$ is a fundamental domain of $\rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$ whose one end is a segment of $F$ containing $\gamma_\infty(p)$, then $\gamma_n(p)$ can be contained in $D$ only once. Hence $\gamma_n(p)$ cannot converge to $\gamma_\infty(p)$. Therefore $\gamma_\infty(C)$ can only contain two endpoints of $F$. Since $C$ is connected, $\gamma_\infty(C)$ must be only one endpoint of $F$, which completes the proof. □

*Remark* 5.4. Note that the proof of Proposition 5.3 works for strictly convex real projective structures of finite Hilbert volume. Hence the holonomies of convex projective structures of finite Hilbert volume on a surface, which are positive representations, are $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. Even for a parabolic element $\gamma$, $(\gamma^k)$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. See Lemma 8.1. But the orbit $\tau_{\rho,x}(\gamma^k)$ is not a quasigeodesic in $X$ even though it converges to a regular point in $\partial_\infty X$.

**Question.** Let $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ be a holonomy representation of a convex projective structure on $\Sigma$. Then does the geometric limit set of $\rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$ on $\partial_\infty X$ contain only regular points?

This question is related to the uniform regularity of $\rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$, i.e, existence of $\Theta \subset \sigma_{mod}$ such that for any $\gamma_n \to \infty$ in $\rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$, $\gamma_n(x_0)$ is $\Theta$-regular for some fixed base point $x_0 \in X$. We answer this question in the affirmative for positive representations in the last section.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let $\Sigma_1$ be a compact surface with one boundary component. Let $\Gamma = \pi_1(\Sigma_1)$ and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ be the holonomy of a convex projective structure on $\Sigma_1$. Then $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ acting on a convex domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{RP}^2$ properly and freely. Furthermore it admits a $\rho$-equivariant continuous map $\xi : \partial_\infty \Gamma \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$. Note that $\rho(\gamma)$ is hyperbolic for any non-peripheral loop $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\rho(c)$ is either hyperbolic or quasi-hyperbolic or parabolic for a peripheral loop $c$. When $\rho(c)$ is hyperbolic, $\xi$ is a $\rho$-equivariant, antipodal homeomorphism and thus $\rho$ is an Anosov representation. When $\rho(c)$ is quasi-hyperbolic, $\xi$ is a $\rho$-equivariant homeomorphism but not antipodal as explained just before Section 5.1. When $\rho(c)$ is parabolic, as well-known, $\rho$ is a positive representation. We will show that $\rho$ is primitive stable in either case.

We apply Proposition 3.2 to our situation. First, every primitive word is hyperbolic for any convex projective structure on $\Sigma_1$ since the word corresponding to one boundary component is not primitive. Hence (i) in Proposition 3.2 follows. Also (iii) in Proposition 3.2 immediately follows from Proposition 5.3. It only remains to prove (ii) in Proposition 3.2. A proof of (ii) for $\rho$ is exactly the same as proving Theorem 7.2 later. Theorem 7.2 deals with more general situation. To avoid repeating proofs, we do not give a proof here. See the proof of Theorem 7.2 for a proof of (ii). By Proposition 3.2, holonomy representations of convex projective structures on $\Sigma_1$ are $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable.

*Remark* 5.5. Note that the holonomies of convex projective structures on a surface fall into three types: Anosov representation, Positive representation and Quasi-hyperbolic representation. Here a quasi-hyperbolic representation means a holonomy with a quasi-hyperbolic element. Such quasi-hyperbolic representations are neither Anosov nor positive representations. Each quasi-hyperbolic representation $\rho$ admits a $\rho$-equivariant homeomorphism $\xi : \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$ but it is not antipodal. Nonetheless it is $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable.

## 6. REGULARITY AND GRASSMANNIANS

In order to deal with a more general Lie group $\mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R})$, we will look at the actions of egular and singular sequences of elements of $\mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ on Grassmannians.

6.1. **Compound matrices.** Let $I_r^n$ denote the set of strictly increasing sequences of $r$ integers in $\{1,\dots,n\}$. Let $A$ be an $n\times m$ real matrix. Then for each $\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n$ and $\mathbf{j}\in I_r^m$, define the $r\times r$ submatrix $A[\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}]$ of $A$ as

$$A[\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}] = A\left[\begin{array}{c} i_1,\dots,i_r \\ j_1,\dots,j_r \end{array}\right] = (a_{i_k,j_l})_{k=1}^{r}{}_{l=1}^{r}.$$

Namely, $A[\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}]$ is the submatrix of $A$ determined by the rows indexed $i_1,\dots,i_r$ and columns indexed $j_1,\dots,j_r$. The $r$th *compound matrix* of $A$ is defined as the $\binom{n}{r}\times\binom{m}{r}$ matrix with entries

$$(\det A[\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}])_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n,\ \mathbf{j}\in I_r^m}$$

and is denoted by $C_r(A)$ where index sets are arranged in lexicographic order. For an $n\times m$ matrix $A$ and $m\times k$ matrix $B$, it follows from the Cauchy-Binet formula that

$$C_r(AB) = C_r(A)C_r(B)$$

for each $r\le\min\{n,m,k\}$.

6.2. **Grassmannians and Plücker coordinates.** The Grassmannian is defined as the set of $r$-dimensional subspaces of the vector space $\mathbb{R}^n$ and it is denoted by $G(n,r)$. The Grassmannian $G(n,r)$ is described as a subvariety of projective space via the Plücker embedding $\psi : G(n,r) \to \mathbb{P}(\wedge^r \mathbb{R}^n)$ which is defined by

$$\mathrm{Span}(v_1,\dots,v_r) \mapsto [v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_r].$$

It is well known that the Plücker embedding is a well-defined map and its image is closed. Indeed it is a subvariety. Let $(e_1,\dots,e_n)$ be the canonical ordered basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for any element of $\omega \in G(n,r)$, $\psi(\omega)$ has a unique representation in the form of

$$\psi(\omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_r\le n} a_{i_1,\dots,i_r}(e_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{i_r}).$$

The homogeneous coordinates $[a_{\mathbf{i}}]$ are called the *Plücker coordinates* on $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $\omega \in G(n,r)$.

Now we will look at the action of $\mathrm{PGL}_n\mathbb{R}$ on $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ via the Plücker coordinates. A matrix $A \in \mathrm{PGL}_n\mathbb{R}$ defines a map $f_A : \mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$f_A\left(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} a_{\mathbf{i}} A(e_{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_r\le n} a_{i_1,\dots,i_r}(Ae_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge Ae_{i_r}).$$

By the definition of $f_A$, we have that for any $v_1,\dots,v_r \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$f_A(v_1\wedge\cdots\wedge v_r) = Av_1\wedge\cdots\wedge Av_r.$$

To look at this in terms of the Plücker coordinates, let $B$ be the $n\times r$ matrix with column vectors $v_1,\dots,v_r$. Then the Plücker coordinate $a_{\mathbf{i}}$ for $v_1\wedge\cdots\wedge v_r$ is the $r\times r$ minor of $B$ obtained by taking all $r$ columns and the $r$ rows with indices in $\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n$. In other words, the $r$th compound matrix $C_r(B)$ of $B$ is exactly the Plücker coordinates for $v_1\wedge\cdots\wedge v_r$. In a similar way, it can be seen that the $r$th compound matrix $C_r(AB)$ is the Plücker coordinates for $Av_1\wedge\cdots\wedge Av_r$. It follows from the Cauchy-Binet formula that

$$C_r(AB) = C_r(A)C_r(B).$$

Hence we have that

$$f_A\left(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in I_r^n} A(\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j})a_{\mathbf{j}}\right)e_{\mathbf{i}}$$

where $A(\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j})$ denotes the determinant of $A[\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}]$. In conclusion $f_A$ is the projecitve linear transformation of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ that is represented by $C_r(A)$.

6.3. **Dynamics of $\sigma_{mod}$-regular sequences on Grassmannians.** Let $(\gamma_k)$ be a $\sigma_{mod}$-regular sequence in $\mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R})$. We want to see the dynamics of regular sequences on Grassmannians. For simplicity, we first assume that $\gamma_k = \mathrm{Diag}(\lambda_{k,1},\dots,\lambda_{k,n})$ with $\lambda_{k,1}\ge\cdots\ge\lambda_{k,n}>0$ for each $k$. The $\sigma_{mod}$-regularity of $(\gamma_k)$ implies that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{\lambda_{k,i+1}}{\lambda_{k,i}} = 0 \tag{3}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$. As described before, the action of $\gamma_k$ on $G(n,r)$ is the projective linear transformation of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ with matrix $C_r(\gamma_k)$. Since each $\gamma_k$ is a diagonal matrix, it can be easily seen that its $r$th compound matrix $C_r(\gamma_k)$ is also a diagonal matrix for any $r = 1, \ldots, n$. More precisely,

$$\gamma_k \cdot \left(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in I_r^n} \gamma_k(\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}) a_{\mathbf{j}}\right) e_{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} \lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}}.$$

Here $\lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}} = \lambda_{k,i_1}\cdots\lambda_{k,i_r}$ for $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in I_r^n$.

Let $\mathbf{i}_1 = (1, \ldots, r)$. Then it is not difficult to see that for any $\mathbf{i}_1 \neq \mathbf{i} \in I_r^n$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}}}{\lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}_1}} = 0.$$

This implies that if $a_{\mathbf{i}_1} \neq 0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \left[\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}}\right] = \left[\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} \lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}}\right] = \left[\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_r^n} \frac{\lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}}}{\lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}_1}} a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{i}}\right] = [e_{\mathbf{i}_1}]$$

where $[\mathbf{v}]$ denotes the point of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ corresponding to $\mathbf{v} \in \wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n$.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let $(\gamma_k)$ be a $\sigma_{mod}$-regular sequence in* $\mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R})$. *Then there exists a subsequence $(\gamma_{n_k})$ such that for each $0 < r < n$, there is a hyperplane $H^-$ of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that on the complement of $H^-$ the sequence of maps $(\gamma_{n_k})$ converges pointwise to the constant map.*

*Proof.* Due to the Cartan decomposition of $\mathrm{PGL}(n,\mathbb{R})$, each $\gamma_k$ can be written as $\gamma_k = s_k a_k t_k$ for some $s_k, t_k \in K$ and $a_k \in \exp\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$. By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $s_k$ and $t_k$ converge to $s_\infty$ and $t_\infty$ in $K$ respectively. For each $0 < r < n$, we put $H^- = t_\infty^{-1}(H_1)$ where $H_1$ is the hyperplane of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ corresponding to $a_{\mathbf{i}_1} = 0$ in the Plücker coordinates. Then it can be easily shown that for every point $\omega \notin H^-$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \omega = [s_\infty e_{\mathbf{i}_1}].$$

This implies the proposition. ☐

We now look at the case that a sequence $(\gamma_k)$ is not $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. For simplicity, as before, we assume that every $\gamma_k$ is a diagonal matrix given by $\mathrm{Diag}(\lambda_{k,1}, \ldots, \lambda_{k,n})$ with $\lambda_{k,1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{k,n} > 0$ for each $k$. If a sequence $(\gamma_k)$ is not $\sigma_{mod}$-regular, then for some $0 < r_0 < n$, the property of (3) fails. Namely,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_{k,r_0+1}}{\lambda_{k,r_0}} = c \tag{4}$$

for some $0 < c \leq 1$. We may assume that $r_0$ is the smallest number for which (3) fails. Looking at the action of $\gamma_t$ on $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^{r_0}\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}_2}}{\lambda_{k,\mathbf{i}_1}} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_{k,r_0+1}}{\lambda_{k,r_0}} = c$$

where $\mathbf{i}_1 = (1, \ldots, r_0)$ and $\mathbf{i}_2 = (1, \ldots, r_0 - 1, r_0 + 1)$.

Due to $c \neq 0$, if

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \omega_1 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \omega_2$$

for $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{r_0}\mathbb{R}^n)\backslash H_1$, then $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ must be contained in a hyperplane of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^{r_0}\mathbb{R}^n)$ for which the ratio of the $a_{\mathbf{i}_2}$-coordinate to the $a_{\mathbf{i}_1}$-coordinate is constant. In summary we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let $(\gamma_k)$ be a sequence in $\mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$. Suppose that for each $0 < r < n$, there exists a frame of $\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n$ such that the sequence of maps $\gamma_k$ sends all elements of the frame to one point in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $(\gamma_k)$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular.*

*Proof.* Let $\gamma_k = s_k a_k t_k$ be the Cartan decomposition of $\gamma_k$. By passing to a subsequence, we assume that $s_k$ and $t_k$ converge to $s_\infty$ and $t_\infty$ respectively. Assume that $(\gamma_k)$ is not $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. Then from the observation above, there is a number $0 < r_0 < n$ such that (3) fails. If

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \omega_1 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \omega_2$$

for $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{r_0}\mathbb{R}^n) \setminus H^-$, it is not difficult to show that $t_\infty(\omega_1)$ and $t_\infty(\omega_2)$ must be contained in a hyperplane of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^{r_0}\mathbb{R}^n)$. This implies that any frame of $\wedge^{r_0}\mathbb{R}^n$ can never converge to one point in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$. This makes a contradiction to the assumption. Therefore $(\gamma_k)$ with the property in the proposition must be $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. □

Proposition 6.2 provides a tool to prove the $\sigma_{mod}$-regularity of a sequence. This will be useful in proving the $\sigma_{mod}$-regularities of positive representations. Note that in order to apply Proposition 6.2 to a sequence, we need information about the action of a sequence on each projective space $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$. Furthermore it is possible to prove the $\sigma_{mod}$-regularity of a sequence only with information about the action of a sequence on each Grassmannian as follows.

**Corollary 6.3.** *Let $(\gamma_k)$ be a sequence in $\mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$. Suppose that for each $0 < r < n$, there exists a Zariski-dense subset of $G(n, r)$ such that the sequence of maps $\gamma_k$ converges to a constant map on the Zariski-dense subset. Then $(\gamma_k)$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular.*

*Proof.* We think of $G(n, r)$ as a subvariety of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ via the Plücker coordinates. Clearly, the action of $\mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ on $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r\mathbb{R}^n)$ preserves the subvariety $G(n, r)$. Suppose that $(\gamma_k)$ is not $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. Then for some $0 < r_0 < n$, the property (4) holds. Let $H_y$ be a hyperplane of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^{r_0}\mathbb{R}^n)$ for which the ratio of the $a_{\mathbf{i}_2}$-coordinate to the $a_{\mathbf{i}_1}$-coordinate is $y \in \mathbb{R}$. It is easy to see that $G(n, r_0) \cap H_y$ is a subvariety of $G(n, r_0)$ with codimension 1. Let $\gamma_k = s_k a_k t_k$ be the Cartan decomposition of $\gamma_k$. Assume that $s_k$ and $t_k$ converge to $s_\infty$ and $t_\infty$ respectively. If

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \omega_1 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \cdot \omega_1$$

for $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in G(n, r_0)$, then $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ must be contained in the subvariety $t_\infty^{-1} \cdot (G(n, r_0) \cap H_y) = G(n, r_0) \cap t_\infty^{-1} \cdot H_y$ of $G(n, r_0)$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}$. This means that any Zariski-dense subset of $G(n, r_0)$ can never converge to one point in $G(n, r_0)$. This implies the Corollary. □

## 7. POSITIVE REPRESENTATIONS

In this section we will give a proof for Theorem 1.3 and 1.5. Given a positive representation $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, it admits a positive $\rho$-equivariant continuous map $\xi : \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Every positive representation of a compact, oriented surface (possibly) with boundary is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular.*

*Proof.* Let $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ be a positive representation for a compact, oriented surface $\Sigma$ with (possible) boundary. Let $\xi : \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$ be the positive $\rho$-equivariant homeomorphism associated to $\rho$ for some $p$. Note that $\xi$ is a hyperconvex curve. Let $(\gamma_k)$ be an arbitrary sequence of elements of $\Gamma = \rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$. Let $\gamma_k^+$ and $\gamma_k^-$ denote the attracting fixed point and repelling fixed point of $\gamma_k$ on $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p$ respectively. Assume that $\gamma_k^+$ and $\gamma_k^-$ converge to $\gamma_\infty^+$ and $\gamma_\infty^-$ respectively. Note that $\gamma_\infty^+$ and $\gamma_\infty^-$ may be equal. Then on $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p \setminus \{\gamma_\infty^-\}$, the sequence of maps $\gamma_k$ converges to the constant map, which sends all of $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p \setminus \{\gamma_\infty^-\}$ to $\gamma_\infty^+$. Since $\xi$ is hyperconvex, it is possible to choose $n$ points $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ on $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma)_p \setminus \{\gamma_\infty^-\}$ so that $\{\xi^1(x_1), \ldots, \xi^1(x_n)\}$ is a frame of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for each $0 < r < n$, the set

$$\mathcal{B}_r = \{\xi^1(x_{i_1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi^1(x_{i_r}) \mid 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq n\}$$

is a basis for $\wedge^r \mathbb{R}^n$. Noting that for any $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \gamma_k \cdot x_i = \gamma_\infty^+$$

and $\xi$ is hyperconvex, it follows from the property (1) of hyperconvex Frenet curves that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \left[ \bigoplus_{j=1}^{r} \gamma_k \cdot \xi^1(x_{i_j}) \right] = \lim_{k \to \infty} \left[ \bigoplus_{j=1}^{r} \xi^1(\gamma_k \cdot x_{i_j}) \right] = \xi^r(\gamma_\infty^+).$$

In other words, the sequence of maps $\gamma_k$ sends all elements of $\mathcal{B}_r$ to one point $\xi^r(\gamma_\infty^+)$ for each $0 < r < n$. By Proposition 6.2, it immediately follows that $(\gamma_k)$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. This completes the proof. □

Proposition 7.1 implies that every positive representation satisfies (iii) in Proposition 3.2. Furthermore it is well known that for any positive representation, its monodromy around any non-trivial non-boundary loop is positive hyperbolic (see [4, Theorem 1.9]). Hence (i) in Proposition 3.2 also holds for every positive representation. To verify that a positive representation is $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable, it only remains to check that (ii) in Proposition 3.2 holds.

**Theorem 7.2.** *Every positive representation of a compact oriented surface with one boundary component is $\sigma_{mod}$-primitive stable.*

*Proof.* Let $\Sigma_1$ be a compact oriented surface with one boundary component. Let $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma_1) \to \mathrm{PGL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ be a positive representation with a continuous $\rho$-equivariant positive map $\beta : \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma_1) \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$. As mentioned above, it suffices to prove that (ii) in Proposition 3.2 holds.

Let $\mathcal{P}_e$ be the subset of $\mathcal{P}$ of bi-infinite geodesics $q : \mathbb{Z} \to \pi_1(\Sigma_1)$ with $q(0) = e$. Then we claim that there exists a uniform constant $D = D(\rho, x)$ such that

$$d_X(x, \mathcal{F}(\xi(q^-), \xi(q^+))) \leq D$$

for all $q \in \mathcal{P}_e$ where $\mathcal{F}(\sigma_+, \sigma_-)$ is the unique maximal flat connecting two opposite flags $\sigma_+$ and $\sigma_-$ in $\mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$. Once the claim is proved, we will be done. To see why, for an arbitrary bi-infinite geodesic $q : \mathbb{Z} \to \pi_1(\Sigma_1)$ in $\mathcal{P}$ with ideal endpoints $q^\pm \in \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma_1)$, consider the $k$-shifting of the parametrization of $q$, denoted by $q[k] : \mathbb{Z} \to \pi_1(\Sigma_1)$, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, defined by $q[k](i) = q(k + i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Noting that $q(k)^{-1} \cdot q[k] : \mathbb{Z} \to \pi_1(\Sigma_1)$ is an element of $\mathcal{P}_e$, we have

$$d_X(q(k)x, \mathcal{F}(\xi(q^-), \xi(q^+))) = d_X(x, \mathcal{F}(\xi(q(k)^{-1}q^-), \xi(q(k)^{-1}q^+))) \leq D$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies the lemma.

Now it remains to prove the claim. Suppose that the claim dose not hold. Then there exists a sequence $(q_n : \mathbb{Z} \to \pi_1(\Sigma_1))$ of bi-infinite geodesics of $\mathcal{P}_e$ such that

$$d_X(x, \mathcal{F}(\xi(q_n^-), \xi(q_n^+))) \to \infty \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Due to the compactness of $\partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma_1)$, we can assume that $q_n^\pm \to q_\infty^\pm$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\infty(\Sigma_1)$ be the set of endpoints of the preimages of one boundary curve in the Cayley graph of $\pi_1(\Sigma_1)$. Since $(q_n)$ is a family of geodesics with $q_n(0) = e$, one can apply Arzela-Ascoli theorem to $(q_n)$. By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $q_n$ converges to a bi-infinite geodesic $q_\infty$ with $q_\infty(0) = e$. Furthermore $q_\infty^\pm$ should be the endpoints of $q_\infty$. This implies that they are distinct.

If one of $q_\infty^\pm$ is in $\mathcal{B}_\infty(\Sigma_1)$, this means that a sequence of primitive elements corresponding to $q_n$ winds more and more around the one boundary component of $\Sigma_1$. Minsky [20] showed that this never happen due to the blocking property of the one boundary component of $\Sigma_1$. For this reason, it follows that $q_\infty^\pm \notin \mathcal{B}_\infty(\Sigma_1)$.

The $\rho$-equivariant continuous map $\xi : \partial_\infty \pi_1(\Sigma_1) \to \mathrm{Flag}(\sigma_{mod})$ is a one-to-one map on the complement of $\mathcal{B}_\infty(\Sigma_1)$. Since $q_\infty^\pm$ are distinct and $q_\infty^\pm \notin \mathcal{B}_\infty(\Sigma_1)$, the sequence of maximal flats $\mathcal{F}(\xi(q_n^-), \xi(q_n^+))$ converges to a maximal flat $\mathcal{F}(\xi(q_\infty^-), \xi(q_\infty^+))$ and thus

$$d_X(x, \mathcal{F}(\xi(q_n^-), \xi(q_n^+))) \to d_X(x, \mathcal{F}(\xi(q_\infty^-), \xi(q_\infty^+))) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

This contradicts the assumption that $d_X(x, \mathcal{F}(\xi(q_n^-), \xi(q_n^+))) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore the theorem holds. □

## 8. Geometric limit set of convex projective structures on surface

Let $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ be a holonomy representation of a finite volume convex projective structure on a compact surface $\Sigma$ with boundary. For parabolic element $\gamma \in \rho(\pi_1(\Sigma))$, it turns out that for any $x_0 \in X$, $\gamma^n x_0$ converges to a barycenter of a Weyl chamber at infinity where $X$ is the symmetric space associated to $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$

**Lemma 8.1.** *If $\gamma$ is parabolic, then $\gamma^n x_0$ converges to a barycenter.*

*Proof.* Let

$$\gamma_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \ \gamma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to [19], any parabolic isometry $\gamma$ is conjugate to $\gamma_0$. Since $\gamma_0$ is conjugate to $\gamma_1$, there exists an element $g \in \mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ such that $\gamma = g\gamma_1 g^{-1}$. We can compute the Cartan projection $\mu(\gamma_1^n) \in \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$ by finding the eigenvalues of $\gamma_1^n(\gamma_1^n)^t$. A straightforward computation shows that $\gamma_1^n(\gamma_1^n)^t$ has three distinct eigenvalues $\alpha, 1, \alpha^{-1}$ where $\alpha$ is a solution of the equation

$$x^2 - (n^4 + 5n^2 + 2)x + 1 = 0.$$

This implies that $\mu(\gamma_1^n)$ exactly points to the barycenter of the positive Weyl chamber $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$. Noting that

$$\|\mu(g_1 g_2 g_3) - \mu(g_2)\| \leq \|\mu(g_1)\| + \|\mu(g_3)\|$$

for any $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in \mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ in [13, Lemma 2.3], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(5) \qquad \|\mu(\gamma^n) - \mu(\gamma_1^n)\| &&= \|\mu(g\gamma_1^n g^{-1}) - \mu(\gamma_1^n)\| \\ &(6) &&\leq \|\mu(g)\| + \|\mu(g^{-1})\| = 2\|\mu(g)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since every $\mu(\gamma_1^n)$ points to the barycenter as seen before, $\mu(\gamma^n)$ converges to a barycenter. This completes the proof. □

Let $\Omega$ be a strictly convex domain with $C^1$ boundary equipped with a Hilbert metric. There is a notion of parallel transport $T^t$ due to Foulon [6, 7]. The parallel Lyapunov exponent of $v \in T_x\Omega$ along $\phi^t(x,[\psi])$ is defined to be

$$\eta((x,[\psi]),v) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log F(T^t(v)).$$

Then a point $w = (x,[\psi]) \in H\Omega$ is regular if and only if there exists a decomposition

$$T_x\Omega = \mathbb{R}\psi \oplus E_0(w) \oplus (\oplus_{i=1}^p E_i(w)) \oplus E_{p+1}(w),$$

and real numbers

$$-1 = \eta_0(w) < \eta_1(w) < \cdots < \eta_p(w) < \eta_{p+1} = 1,$$

such that for any $v_i \in E_i \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log F(T_w^t(v_i)) = \eta_i(w),$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log|\det T_w^t| = \sum_{i=0}^{p+1} \dim E_i(w)\eta_i(w).$$

The Lyapunov exponents have to do with the convexity of the boundary of $\Omega$. For 2-dimensional $\Omega$, the boundary $\partial\Omega$ can be written as the graph of a convex function $f$. Such a function $f$ is said to be *approximately $\alpha$-regular* for an $\alpha \in [1,\infty]$, if

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\log \frac{f(t)+f(-t)}{2}}{\log|t|} = \alpha.$$

This quantity is invariant under affine and projective transformations. Approximately $\alpha$-regular means that the function behaves like $|t|^\alpha$ near the origin. The case $\alpha = \infty$ means that the boundary point belongs to a flat segment.

Let $\xi \in \partial\Omega$. Let $w = (x, [\psi]) \in H\Omega = T\Omega \setminus \{0\}/\mathbb{R}_+^*$ be regular such that $\psi(\infty) = \xi$. Let $\mathcal{H}_w$ be a horocycle based at $\xi$ and passing through $x$. It is shown in [3, Proposition 3.4.9] that for any $v(w) \in T_x\mathcal{H}_w$,

$$\eta(w, v(w)) = \frac{2}{\alpha(\xi)} - 1. \tag{7}$$

Suppose $\gamma$ is a hyperbolic isometry whose eigenvalues are $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3$. Then it is shown in Section 3.6 of [3] that

$$\eta(w, v(w)) = -1 + 2\frac{\log\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}}{\log\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}},$$

hence

$$\alpha(\gamma^+)^{-1} = \frac{\log\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}}{\log\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}}. \tag{8}$$

Here $w = (x, [\phi])$, $\phi(\infty) = \gamma^+$ and $v(w) \in T_x\mathcal{H}_w$.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let $\Sigma$ be an orientable, connected, compact surface with boundary and $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ be a positive representation. If $\rho$ is an Anosov representation, it is clear that $\rho$ is uniformly $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. Hence we assume that $\rho$ is not an Anosov representation. Then $\rho$ is a holonomy representation of a strictly convex projective structure of finite Hilbert volume on $\Sigma$ (See [5]). Let $\Omega$ be a strictly convex domain invariant under $\rho$. Then $\partial\Omega$ is $C^1$. Since $\Omega$ is strictly convex, and $\alpha : \partial\Omega \to [1, \infty]$ is continuous, it is bounded above. Hence there exists $K$ such that $\alpha(x) < K$ for any $x \in \partial\Omega$.

Let $\gamma$ be a hyperbolic isometry with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3$ and, the attracting fixed point $\gamma^+ \in \partial\Omega$ and the repelling fixed point $\gamma^- \in \partial\Omega$. By (8),

$$\alpha(\gamma^+) = \frac{\log\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}}{\log\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}} < K.$$

Considering $\gamma^{-1}$, we also obtain

$$\alpha(\gamma^-) = \frac{\log\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}}{\log\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3}} < K.$$

Puting that $x = \log\lambda_1 - \log\lambda_2$ and $y = \log\lambda_2 - \log\lambda_3$, the positive Weyl chamber $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$ is identified with $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \geq 0 \text{ and } y \geq 0\}$. Then it holds that

$$\frac{x+y}{x} < K \text{ and } \frac{x+y}{y} < K.$$

From these inequalities, we have that

$$2K > 2 + \frac{x}{y} + \frac{y}{x} \geq 4 \text{ and thus } K > 2.$$

Furthermore,

$$(K-1)^{-1}x < y < (K-1)x.$$

It is derived from the above inequality and Lemma 8.1 that $\rho$ is uniformly $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. ☐

Theorem 1.4 implies that the set of directions in the limit cone $\mathcal{L}$ of any positive representation in $\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ is a compact subset inside the interior of $\sigma_{mod}$. Recall that the limit cone $\mathcal{L}_\Gamma$ of a discrete subgroup $\Gamma$ of a semisimple Lie group is defined as the smallest closed cone in $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$ containing the image of the Lyapunov projection $\lambda : \Gamma \to \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$ which is induced by the Jordan decomposition. Benoist [1] showed that if $\Gamma$ is Zariski-dense, its limit cone is convex and invariant under the opposite involution of $\sigma_{mod}$. Moreover the geometric limit set of $\Gamma$ in any Weyl chamber at infinity, if nonempty, is naturally identified with the set of directions in $\mathcal{L}_\Gamma$.

To classify the geometric limit sets of holonomies of convex projective structures, we now deal with the holonomies with quasi-hyperbolic elements.

**Lemma 8.2.** *If $\rho$ has a quasi-hyperbolic element, then its limit cone is $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$.*

*Proof.* Recall that $\gamma$ is conjugate to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{where } \alpha, \beta > 0, \alpha^2\beta = 1 \\ \text{and } \alpha, \beta \neq 1. \end{array}$$

Noting that the Jordan decomposition of the above matrix is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{\alpha} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

the Lyapunov projection $\lambda(\gamma)$ of $\gamma$ points to a singular direction in $\sigma_{mod}$. Since the limit cone is convex and invariant under the opposite involution, it can be easily shown that $\mathcal{L} = \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$. □

In accordance with Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 8.2, one can notice that the orbit of a quasi-hyperbolice element is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular but converges to a singular direction as follows. Let $\gamma$ be a quasi-hyperbolic matrix in $\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$. As mentionsed above, we may assume that

$$\gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{where } \alpha, \beta > 0, \alpha^2\beta = 1 \\ \text{and } \alpha, \beta \neq 1. \end{array}$$

By a straight computation, the Cartan projection of $\gamma$ is written as

$$\mu(\gamma^n) = \frac{1}{2}(\ln f(n) - \ln 2,\ \ln 2 + 4n \ln \alpha - \ln f(n),\ -4n \ln \alpha),$$

where $f(n) = n^2\alpha^{2n-2} + 2\alpha^{2n} + \sqrt{n^4\alpha^{4n-4} + 4n^2\alpha^{4n-2}}$. One can check that the distance between the sequence $(\mu(\gamma^n))$ and any wall in $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}^+$ goes to infinity. Hence $\gamma^n$ is $\sigma_{mod}$-regular. To find where the sequence converges, let $\theta_n$ be the angle between $\mu(\gamma_n)$ and the singular line $x = y$ on the plane $x + y + z = 0$. Then we have that

$$\tan \theta_n = \frac{\ln f(n) - 2n \ln \alpha - \ln 2}{2\sqrt{3} n \ln \alpha}.$$

Furthermore by a computation, it can be verified that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\ln f(n)}{n} = 2 \ln \alpha.$$

Therefore it is derived that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \tan\theta_n = 0 \text{ and thus } \lim_{n\to\infty} \theta_n = 0.$$

This implies that the sequence $(\mu(\gamma^n))$ converges to a singular point at infinity.

**Corollary 8.3.** *Let $\Sigma$ be a compact, oriented, surface with (possibly) boundary and negative Euler number. Let $\rho : \pi_1(\Sigma) \to \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ be a holonomy of a convex projective structure on $\Sigma$. Then the following holds.*

- (i) *If $\rho$ dose not have any quasi-hyperbolic element, there exists a compact subset $I$ of $\mathrm{ost}(\sigma_{mod})$ such that the geometric limit set of $\rho$ in any Weyl chamber at infinity, if nonempty, is identified with $I$.*
- (ii) *If $\rho$ has a quasi-hyperbolic element, the geometric limit set of $\rho$ in any Weyl chamber at infinity, if nonempty, is identified with $\sigma_{mod}$.*

## References

[1] Y. Benoist, Automorphismes des cônes convexes, Invent. Math. 141 (2000), no. 1, 149–193.

[2] Benzécri, Sur les variétés localement affines et projectives, Bull. Soc. Math. Fr 88 (1960), 229-332.

[3] M. Crampon, Dynamics and entropies of Hilbert metrics, Thèse, Université de Strasbourg, 2011.

[4] V. Fock and A. Goncharov, Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. No. 103 (2006), 1–211.

[5] V. Fock and A. Goncharov, Moduli spaces of convex projective structures on surfaces, Adv. Math. 208 (2007), no. 1, 249–273.

[6] P. Foulon, Géométrie des équations différentielle du second ordre, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, 45 (1986), 1-28.

[7] P. Foulon, Estimation de l'entropie des systèmes lagrangiens sans points conjugués, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Phys. Théor., 57 (2) (1992), 117-146. With an appendix, "About Finsler geometry".

[8] F. Guéritaud, O. Guichard, F. Kassel and A. Wienhard, Anosov representations and proper actions, arXiv:1502.03811.

[9] O. Guichard and A. Wienhard, Anosov representations : Domains of discontinuity and applications, Invent. math. 190, no. 2, (2012), 357–438.

[10] W. Jeon, I. Kim, K. Ohshika and C. Lecuire, Primitive stable representations of free Kleinian groups, Israel J. Math. 199, no. 2 (2014), 841-866.

[11] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb and J. Millson, Convex functions on symmetric spaces, side lengths of polygons and the stability inequalities for weighted configurations at infinity, J. Diff. Geom. Vol. 81 (2009), 297–354.

[12] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb and J. Porti, Morse actions of discrete groups on symmetric spaces, arXiv:1403.7671.

[13] F. Kassel, Proper actions on corank-one reductive homogeneous spaces, J. Lie Theory 18 (2008), 961–978.

[14] F. Labourie, Anosov flows, surface groups and curves in projective space, Invent. Math. Vol 165, No. 1, (2006), 51–114.

[15] I. Kim and M. Lee, Separable-stable representations of compression body, Top. and its App. 206 (2016), 171-184.

[16] F. Labourie, Goldman algebra, opers and the swapping algebra, 2012, hal-01141625.

[17] F. Labourie and G. McShane, Cross ratios and identities for higher Teichmüller-Thurston theory, Duke Math. J. 149 (2009), no. 2, 279–345.

[18] G. Lusztig, Total positivity in reductive groups, Lie theory and geometry, Progr. Math., 123, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA (1994), 531–568.

[19] L. Marquis, Surface projective convexe de volume fini, Annales des L'Inst. Fourier, 62 (2012), 325-392.

[20] Y. Minsky, On dynamics of Out($\Gamma$) on $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ characters, Israel J. of Math. 193 (2013), 47–70.
[21] J. H. C. Whitehead, On certain sets of elements in a free group, Proc. London Math. Soc. 41 (1936), 48–56.
[22] J. H. C. Whitehead, On equivalent sets of elements in a free group, Annals of Math. 37 (1936), 782–800.

School of Mathematics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Hoegiro 85, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, 130-722, Republic of Korea
*E-mail address*: `inkang@kias.re.kr`

Department of Mathematics, Jeju National University, 102 Jejudaehak-ro, Jeju, 63243, Republic of Korea
*E-mail address*: `sungwoon@jejunu.ac.kr`